A. interpretation: if the aff/neg justifies a pre-fiat role of the ballot other than proving the truth or falsity or normative desirability of the resolution through post-fiat advocacies, he or she must have a text contextualizing *[what the role of the judge should be delineated via spacing or bolding. The aff/neg must specify]* how to weigh links back to this role of the ballot within the text clearly delineated through spacing or bolding.

B. Violation:

C. Standards.

1. Critical engagement - This shell turns your pre-fiat reasons to prefer since we can’t have a good discussion under the implicit role of the ballot you assume if I don’t know what it is - critical clash is the strongest link back to your case since a) otherwise your role of the ballot becomes an exclusive tool ONLY you fully understand that excludes me from engaging in discussion rather than promoting healthy dialogue b) more debate on the issue ensures we can deconstruct power structures/interrogate oppression/racism/sexism more comprehensively to try and achieve real solutions, but if we’re 2 ships passing in the night in comprehending the pre-fiat debate, then it undermines the solvency for your critical pedagogy.

2. scope of ground - even if your role of the ballot is true a) no way to assess who's better meeting it since what constitutes \_\_\_\_ is vague - clearly delineated text for how we weigh links solves since it provides a clear metric available to both debaters. b) absent a text you can escape my attempts to link into your ROB by re-clarifying how it functions - text uniquely key to accountability since 1) cross-ex, your critical cards, etc. are all interpreted by debaters, scholars, and judges differently so a stable text key to accessing your unique critical benefits - else ballot can be used to endorse a false conception of your critical ROB.  2) your job to clarify how the ROB functions while you’re reading the aff/neg - else I lose key understanding of the goal of your pedagogy while you’re reading the constructive which is the best time for understanding. Further, my interp is not exclusive with implicit understanding of your arg, discussion in cross-ex, etc. so it’s net beneficial to have this text as well.

A. interpretation: debaters who defend a rejection of capitalism must specify in the form of a text in the NC a positive vision for the type of world they endorse beyond merely a rejection of cap. Examples of meeting my interp include socialism, communism, Marxism or feudalism, or some amalgamation.

1. [same arguments for a neg advocacy text]

2. contradictory ground – it’s impossible to generate links to DAs since a) you could possibly defend contradictory alternatives to capitalism and b) there are infinitely things that are not capitalism. Key to clash and fairness since otherwise I cannot engage with the substance of the K and judges vote on offense. O/w since it’s a question of engaging your advocacy.